



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

8
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/830,226	04/23/2001	Paul Aubrey Greenfield	09/100.000	3270
7590	08/09/2005		EXAMINER [REDACTED]	CAO, DIEM K
Mark T Starr Unisys Corporation Unisys Way MS E8 114 Blue Bell, PA 19424			ART UNIT [REDACTED]	PAPER NUMBER 2194

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/830,226	GREENFIELD ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Diem K. Cao	2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
 THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 May 2005.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-40 remain in the application. Applicant has amended claims 1, 14, 27 and 28.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/11/2005 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 26 recites the limitation "said terminal screen definitions" in page 25. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-7, 10-20, 23-26, 27-34 and 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phanourious et al. (Transforming Command-Line Driven Systems to Web Applications) in view of Eager et al. (U.S. 5,969,200).

6. As to claim 1, Phanourious teaches a method for adapting a legacy software application (Idrag program; page 2 and abstract), created from legacy source code and developed for an environment comprising a centralized computing resource interconnected to a series of computer terminal devices (Unix computers; page 2), to a network environment (Web; page 2), wherein the network environment comprises a system of distributed, interconnected network computing resources (computers have access to Internet; page 2 and abstract), the method comprising the steps of utilizing the legacy code to produce a series of executable software components (Interface server; page 4 and Interface client generates the GUI from an application description; page 6) that provide the functionality for interaction with the legacy software application (anyone can visit a Web page ... When a user visits a Web page ... visualization and further analysis; page 2 and Figs. A, B, C), the components being executable by at least one of the computing resources in the network environment (The HTTP server returns an applet that is the Javamatic interface client; page 5 and Fig. 3), and wherein upon execution, the computing resource is caused to interconnect with the legacy software application over the network so as to interact with the legacy software application in the transmission or receipt of information to and from the legacy software application (Fig. 3 and associated text; pages 5-6).

7. However, Phanourious does not explicitly teach the legacy source code. Eager teaches utilizing the legacy source to create a series of executable software components (Information stored in the user interface ... structures 118; col. 23, lines 35-45 and col. 9, lines 45-65).

8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Phanourious and Eager because Eager's system provides a method to transition an entire enterprise to a distributed infrastructure.

9. As to claim 2, Eager teaches the legacy software application includes interface specification definitions which include definitions of screen formats (Information stored in the user interface ... structures 118; col. 23, lines 35-45), the step of producing the series of software components further comprising generating a series of user interface software components from the screen format definitions (Information stored in the user interface ... structures 118; col. 23, lines 35-45 and col. 9, lines 45-65), the user interface software components being arranged for execution on the network computer resource to provide a graphical user interface providing at least data entry and display facilities of the interface specification definitions (Fig. 4 and associated text and col. 33, lines 20-30 and 42-43).

10. As to claim 3, Phanourious as modified teaches the interface software components are arranged to generate forms corresponding to forms generated by the legacy software application (Figs. A, B, C and page 2).

11. As to claim 4, Phanourious teaches the client interface components being arranged to interact over the network with the legacy software application (Fig. 3 and associated text; pages 5-6).

12. As to claim 5, Phanourious teaches the client interface components include a user input object which is arranged to receive data input by a user of the network computing resource and transmit data to the legacy application, over the network (Figs. A, B, C, 3 and associated text).

13. As to claim 6, Phanourious teaches the series of software components are loadable and executable by an Internet Browser (The HTTP server returns an applet; page 5).

14. As to claim 7, Phanourious teaches the series of software components comprise Java code applet (applet; page 5 and Interface Client; page 6).

15. As to claim 10, Phanourious teaches the network environment comprises the Internet network (Web page, URL; page 2).

16. As to claim 11, Eager teaches the network environment utilizes TCP/IP transfer protocols (TCP/IP; col. 22, lines 30-43).

17. As to claim 12, Phanourious does not teach the source code is written in a 4GL language. Phanourious teaches the legacy application in general and can be applied to multiple type of

applications. It would have been obvious the legacy system of Phanourious could also include the 4GL application.

18. As to claim 13, Phanourious does not teach the source code is written in a LINC language. Phanourious teaches the legacy application in general and can be applied to multiple types of applications. It would have been obvious the legacy system of Phanourious could also include the LINC application.

19. As to claims 14 and 28, they correspond to the method claim of claim 1 except they are computer product and system claims, respectively.

20. As to claims 15-20, see rejections of claims 2-7 above.

21. As to claims 23-24, see rejections of claims 10-11 above.

22. As to claim 25, see rejection of claim 13 above.

23. As to claim 26, Eager teaches the terminal screen definitions are written in a screen control language (col. 30, lines 45-53).

24. As to claims 28-34, see rejections of claims 2-7 above.

25. As to claims 37-40, see rejections of claims 10-13 above.

26. As to claim 27, see rejection of claims 1 and 12 above. Eager further teaches template definitions (Information stored in the user interface ... structures 118; col. 23, lines 35-45).

27. Claims 8, 21, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phanourious et al. (Transforming Command-Line Driven Systems to Web Applications) in view of Eager et al. (U.S. 5,969,200) further in view of Apte et al. (U.S. 6,662,236 B1).

28. As to claim 8, Phanourious and Eager do not teach the series of software components are executable by scripting language running on the network computing resource. Apte teaches the series of software components are executable by scripting language running on the network computing resource (JavaScript complements Java ... of an applet; col. 2, lines 38-48 and Fig. 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Phanourious, Eager and Apte to the system of Phanourious because it can expose useful properties of Java applets.

29. As to claims 21 and 35, see rejections of claim 8 above.

30. Claims 9, 22, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phanourious et al. (Transforming Command-Line Driven Systems to Web Applications) in view

of Eager et al. (U.S. 5,969,200) further in view of Harold (Using Component Methods in an Applet).

31. As to claim 9, Phanourious and Eager do not teach the translatable source code includes a series of data fields and object oriented methods for setting or obtaining values of the series of data fields. Harold teaches the translatable source code includes a series of data fields and object-oriented methods for setting or obtaining values of the series of data fields (Since applets are subclass of ... paint () method; page 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Phanourious, Eager and Harold because it provides a method to obtain and setting value for object written in Java language.

32. As to claims 22 and 36, see rejections of claim 9 above.

Response to Arguments

33. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Diem K. Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-3760. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 5:30AM - 1:00PM, Saturday, 5:30AM - 10:30AM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist at 571-272-2100.

Due to the realignment of WG 2120, effective March 20, 2005, AU 2126 will become AU 2194.

Diem Cao